

We must have figured SO and Castro
expected invasion!

Did we miss that?

"Still much later" (McN)

And we could see SO moving in air in 1962 -

Wf? (did we think)

What if the announced port

(as

Did McN - what would the day of the
be an invasion?

(Wf not expect two more
and troops

DDI

Wf did not think Sov were heading to work?

Wf didn't expect more?

MRBCK

SO failure to announce < FKRg
gave false message' FROG;

the unit there - → warden (first: Oct 1, Oct 23

seeing after air → troops: 40K

had no rationing, → Port? (Secret? There was!

was counter substance!

What US found later

MUN & China - 2 yrs later?

→ Delegation

12-5-11

JFK - "I would have been informed."

So I couldn't refrain from a move
that risked Annihilation

Does DIO
carry this?

How many copies are there of the cards
convinced by DIO (to authenticate)?

Does he carry it to keep holder
of football from being able to authenticate?

What if he's missing?

shot: JFK, D, (the) Final (?)
who gets it from his clothes -
is it THE RING? with
the football?

Why did Andropov come to know RYAN
in 1983 - what did he plan to do with info?

Revelation)
Deard Haul spotted since 1981 Nov 1984

TARGETS? ("Alternate Undertaking")

Insider by - "let's put on a show"

"I want them to go to be warning..." (Who?)

12-6-11

Cultural genocide

frankenstein genocide
accidental

Unintended/purposive (but foreseeable,
acceptable)

Acceptable genocide

"Suicide": 2 forms - ritual

↳ ancient (D.M.)

or "suicide by cop"

Old Man Out

corp. punishment

↳ deliberate not-killing

not-killing

Violence?

Fast

Can this fit "even rationality"?

Self-interest?

Gen Scott

Final USGP: Backing into West Europe
Hot pursuit!

Kohl: rational scenario 3

Rationality + deterrence

(Hodgkiss: nat. & soc.)

simple: do you prefer to live?

to not live tortured?

to have your children live?

What risks will you take - for what?
of what

Some yes, some no: (range of prob.)

Most would draw back from certainty
of pursuit.

But: near center (from D.M.)

to advancing,

though in reality...

not even - near center: (over)

Consider what "high deterrence" (AUS) assume
about the nature of a calculating, "rational"
opponent: irrevocably reckless, ruthless (of
own people + others), ... (and wrong: false
world-ambition (Rogers/Andropov) alarm)

"FS could be rat. choice"

COMBINATION

(ONLY IF WE MADE IT SO - by threat
as well as vulnerability! (both depend on both parties + POKS
THREAT)

Afghanistan (450.) was not ^{SB not} ~~presented~~ ^(ex. 1000000)
a threat.

But best delegated Rozanski to...

(Kroms? Kelly? Sparty? ... WHO?)

Note 3d bomb - withdrawn deflation!

4. Quoting VS Cas - was not among the
reasons for dropping Bomb(s) in August
without warning,
terms

Scott 28

K did make a non-bluff - FS/EU threat -

Lyde II Out

in Cuba! = NATO, + ...

Berlin, TURKEY

= US threats!

(Kroms)

(us. bluffs in Cuba-I, Aug)

Berlin rockets! - machine!

At was 1) ^{semi-} advent / incident (workbooks
MRBM, not revealed)

2) covert / incident

not revealed! not threatened!

too was, rules

Scott: 33

If a L.V. Item B (of jmt, NIE!) had
looked at ~~US~~ US policy in 1961-62
including what I contributed

and ^{and my} Guinean

oct '61 Hilpatine (see memo)

1962 Am. Action (after Ph.D. thesis was in')

in context of JFK and McN articles + statements
and IRBM deployment

and MM program, B-52, etc. Polaris
and Day Crickets, too much

(see Leak: to Wash. Star?)

+ Fryklund (date?)

+ JFK July 28th on Berlin!

(see - Hilpatine!)

+ ATHENS

and invasion plans for Cuba

+ Mangrove

+ De Soto

(+ failure of C-I → invasion!)

(+ Laos!)

^R
(and his plans for Texas rivers! + sub
see Castro influence!)

A contributed
to instability;

Herbert K. Levine

FS was in it!

John De would have seen 'readiness' for

FS (despite JFK + McN attitudes)

2) imminent crisis

3) Could have interpreted ambiguous evidence (D-2 on
SV)

AS EVIDENCE

AJW/RAND → JRC build-up 1961-

(I tried to reverse delegation

I tried to improve 2d-strike retals:

vs. deep.	avoid cities
vs. UA	Koreans
for PALS	China
vs. FU	

BUT: made for better (coverage)

1st-strike plan (2 C-II!)

(and rem as much of SU: 1962!)

(SU threat, later, in Kitzge expo: CPD)

12-7-11

Have crises:

C-II

"Ambiguous crack between impossibility
and unlikelihood. (Gill + Aileen; Scott)

(

1% doctrine (vs. 0%) China

"small prob. of (horrible) event" McN

[Difference between (in C-II)

no warheads

no use rules

no too much

no use at will

whether " (no PACs)

whether orders or not, obligation or not,

"Pres control" or not

~~Section~~

Section

"

"

"operational"?

[no difference to VCS? ???

WTF?!

(What would C-II a crisis — US option of

blockade, attack, war (begin operation

"real deadline",

not "operational"

prior full prep, in

(of course, FA) scheduled exercise

(use in Pres. expectation of (possible) war?)

JPR improving!

(less so: Wife, some intell, McCon

VCS?!

(first recommendation?)

12-7-11

What did McCone think US/JFK should do?

(prior to Oct 14?)

Did he tell ... anyone?

Did his weekly-brief cables get to JFK?

control CIA?

Just - strongly - he was wrong, about
SAMs - probably, they were not used
on Oct 14!

(any more than two acres
40K troops
are needed)

Role of mercy (SU) is critical!

(US - "javel" mercy, Oct 16-22?)

o

(I was wrong about SU lying -

just, did (not) K only on JFK

combining of silence before election,
conspiracy

if he found out?

(with the ^{Scott} organ - at Pol. unhappily,

"battered," "big fool")

(F. H. - like Long, Shultz)

Certainty or Insurability Premium —

(Wf? Rational?)

Difference between

0% - 1%

or 99% - 100%

or 5% - 6%

80% - 81%

Hyp: exp. where 1) Payoff is extreme (good -
or exp., bad (exp. non-
center, S-T, period)

(though also: even a small or medium

loss "is seen as extreme, or dealt

with as if extreme, if/when it is

"certain" — i.e. S-T

2) Effort of Payoff is a "state-change"

(32° - 33° F

loss of job, status, relationship, future (historical)

deadline (ultimatum)

illegal/criminal

Non-linear^U (corner, knee, wall)

"Payoff of ransom"

(Brennanli — "winning argument")

even for rich men,
prisoners

(Krisakki)

blackmail

paying debt to Mafia

C-II

Review of McN (see invasion, Megover)
or Louman, Schles, Brady

one simply not to be seen as "objective
history"!

at least, heart-breaking

facts
intentions

- all propaganda

aims
interpretations

reputation - protecting

institution - protecting

(see forms on F level:

crews, cocaine
NYRB, Oct 11

For "crimes" - making that crimes were
(to what be) operative & had to be denied
(for public?) or ignored
as VCS would able to do!

Scott 52. Can it possibly be said that it was
a miscalculation, misunderstanding, error for SV
& others [AND VCS?] to believe that US would will
win? will high enough prob [critical prob?]
to justify deterrent [or, really, ^{use} defensive] measures?
(Contingency plans, deployment - exercises?)
to be sure, yes - but was that critical? or, to be sure &
would not need more

53

VER's "no-nuclear" pledge — if triggered —
~~would supersede~~^{was} a big concession.

(for JFE/REF: CIA/US)

(Secret deal: small — both sides. no effort)

(Public deal: big, internationally)

C-II

Scott 152

What has happened was possible —
if the contradictory opponent believes
that it was impossible

then some beliefs of some people in
or similar similar similar

should be discounted, rejected.

Indeed, to some degree, this experience
should reduce confidence in any judgments of
"impossibility."

So — what has happened is possible (again).

e.g. Big Bluff, by several leaders:

"Very unlikely"

K on missile gap

K on FU in Berlin, Cuba, Seng

K on moving blockade

JFK in C-II: demanding withdrawal, as
concessions

McN on FU in Europe

JFK/RFK ULT 27 OCT promising to attack,
invade

Khrushchev: Rush 117 "Full response to 1 missile!"
(USSR/Berlin)

PREEMPTIVE REVENGE (RETAL.)

(SU/U-2 on SU; Castro/invader)

12-9-11

Scott
154

Our controlled claim uses have no
(credible? legit? effective?) use other than
Type I ...

main det

vs. "overhaul"

(ANW)

vs. "main det"
(anecdotal)

Wrong, wrong, wrong

as basis for understanding profit
loss of race
damages
prob. of war

or for negotiating disarm.

abol.

NEU

~~negotiation~~

non-profit

2 for urgency

(Arguments for promoting the error...)

Hyp: This error, failure of understanding,
is involved in lack of success at
any of these (i.e. understanding,
mobilization)

"The problem" is not (just) to get leaders and publics
to recognize this (abysmal) reality ("no use")
and to act on it, but to change the values, the
identity (mission, affiliations, commitments, alliances, image), the

Then moral (obligations, constraints
("optables")
Scott
154 the concern (for "others," the oceans, children,
the future of humanity, environment)

That proposition is not just "unrecognized,
ignored, disbelieved" of leaders + public

It is manifestly intense! Absurd!

("There is weapons for threatening"!

(Trading chocolate - in Hungary, 1945-6
not only, as pening, against one attack!

|| (Cuba, NATO, Andover, DDP...)
Ninoshin, Kogoraki, Amal, Am...

(A number of cons - for demo - one of
them, we. are attack

For US to act on this [NEO, as D-2 Jan

would be to transfer every aspect of
one policy (not such foreign policy?]

R+D

procurement

deployment

Training

plans

targets

commitments

(Berlin
Andover 1954-65

(Am?)

NATO

Scott 160 If US, UK, France promise to hold
- responsible any state who helps (or have)
assisted a war terrorist

that's a compelling reason to be a
NWS - to deter these countries, from
"retal" to a terrorist attack!

Wf was of ("G") - involved in something?

B. CLEARANCES

1. What + know (C3 DT DISCRETION

Plans

BNSP

C3 Plus

(Crisis Studies

Stybolt

U-2

C-17

Kass

PP

2. My anti-Comm, anti-Sov committee

(explain!

Berlin I

3. USMC?

4. RAND (4 elite)

5. NSR (Kittel, Zathman, Kowen,

6. (ECF) How thing

Speicher

Don't see: neon field! (2-man)

Confident beliefs about arms, war

- Unthinkable: no discussion, making, submitting,
of bid. but war, plans: circle
(major authority, strategy)

- No proposal, even: in crisis, or bluff.
Civ

on mail

all but 3 right for SO
policy, pre-1964!

3. Effective NEU policy

4. More threats, total bluff.

reference, "pups" (NATO)

5. A proposal, quickly dismissed (if one were made)

6. No serious, private promise: to all, JCS, everyone

7. Have a recommendation: with for immediate use
or for contingent

8- No JCS demand for commitment

9- No delegation

11- 2-man rule fully observed

12- authentic, PACs

13- no hope of D-C in position (direct)

AWW, OS, AE & D vs FU

(see Beckson/AWW in '6) Berlin)

preparation FU FS (Scott 73)

prevention vulnerability

O-L FS cap dissonance

CF 24-stroke cap

(how good? AWW?
prevention?
CF?)

DOS / DOS leak / PP
WGM

for all from hole
ability to boost inside
an opening in an abdomen
(doctor - ref. f.)

Why "see instead of lose" if as mil. purpose
several? Wellen (revenge
honor

Scott 78: Det they assumes the order (west f. not?)
rationality of Cartman + their visions right help O.L. (disco?)
(ast, Katten/SB/Stalin + Mercedes)